

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,012	02/15/2001	Yuko Iijima	7246/61720	1375
7590 07/06/2004		EXAMI	NER	
Jay H Maioli			TON, ANTHONY T	
Cooper & Dunham 1185 Avenue of the Americas			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
New York, NY	10036		2661	1.
		•	DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004	$\nu$

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1

ş.			$\Lambda\Lambda$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	7
	09/763,012	IIJIMA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anthony T Ton	2661	/
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repleted in the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuted Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may oly within the statutory minimum of t I will apply and will expire SIX (6) M te, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed  hirty (30) days will be considered timely.  ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 F	February 2002.		
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Thi	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	ance except for formal m	atters, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		,	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ier.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 February 2002</u> is/a		objected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	,,, <b>,</b> ,,,,,,,	3 1 1 2 (4) (4)	
1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		Application No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri			
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	st of the certified copies n	ot received.	
Attachment(s)	<b>~~</b>	Output (DTO 442)	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date		of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2661

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

  Kawai (US Patent Application Pub. No. 2001/0012383 A1) in view of Du (US Patent

  No. 6,603,740)
- a) In Regarding to Claims 1, 2 and 5: Kawai disclosed an electronic an apparatus which is connected to another apparatus by a digital communication bus and performs transmission and reception of data through said digital communication bus (see Figs. 1 and 2), comprising:

a display unit (see Fig.1A: 100); and

a control unit for controlling the operation of said display unit (see Fig. 1A: 96), wherein said control unit detects whether said another apparatus and said digital communication bus are connected so as to form a loop or not (a connection or not), and said control unit allows said display unit to perform a warning display (see Paragraph [0009] in page 1).

wherein said digital communication bus is an IEEE1394 serial bus (see Fig. 8: 1394).

Kawai failed to explicitly disclose said control unit detects whether said another apparatus and said digital communication bus are connected so as to form a loop or not

Art Unit: 2661

by discriminating processes which are executed after a bus reset was generated have been finished within a predetermined period.

**Du explicitly disclosed** such a control unit detects whether said another apparatus and said digital communication bus are connected so as to form a loop or not by discriminating processes which are executed after a bus reset was generated have been finished within a predetermined period or not (see co.1 lines 38-50).

At the time of the invention, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine such a control unit detects whether said another apparatus and said digital communication bus are connected so as to form a loop or not by discriminating processes which are executed after a bus reset was generated have been finished within a predetermined period or not, as taught by Du with Kawai, so that a loop between communication devices in a local area network can be detected. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide unique transmission paths to electronic devices in a network system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Du and Kawai the invention as specified in the claims.

b) In Regarding to Claims 3 and 4: Kawai disclosed all aspects of these claims as set forth in the claims 1 and 2, and Kawai further disclosed the processes which are executed after the bus reset was generated (see step S201 in Fig.21).

Both Kawai and Du failed to explicitly disclosed when the processes are not finished within the predetermined period, said control unit detects that they are connected so as to form said loop and allows said display unit to perform said warning display; and when the processes are finished within the predetermined period, said control unit detects that they are not connected so as to form said loop and does not allow said display unit to

Art Unit: 2661

perform said warning display. **However**, **Du disclosed** a bridge terminal that has transmitted certain number of loop test messages to detect there is **no** loop between two terminals when after a predefined period of time a loop test message that has been sent does not return (see abstract an col.1 lines 38-58).

Thus, at the time of the invention, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine such whether display or not display teaching in the instant claims with Du as a design choice, so that a loop between communication devices in a local area network can be detected properly. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an enhancement to Du and reduce the time of testing processes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the instant claims and Du the invention as specified in the claims.

- c) In Regarding to Claims 6-10: these claims are rejected for the same reasons as Claims 1-5, respectively because the apparatus in Claims 1-5 can be used to practice the method steps of Claims 6-10, respectively.
- d) In Regarding to Claims 11-15: the claimed subject matters of these claims 11-15 are similar to that of claims 1-5, respectively, except for the display unit as set forth in the claims 1-5. Therefore, the rejection to the claims 1-5 would apply to reject these claims, respectively.
- e) In Regarding to Claims 16-20: these claims are rejected for the same reasons as Claims 11-15, respectively because the apparatus in Claims 11-15 can be used to practice the method steps of Claims 16-20, respectively.

Art Unit: 2661

## **Examiner Information**

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony T Ton whose telephone number is 703-305-8956. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas W Olms can be reached on 703-305-4703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ATT 6/26/2004

Muin En